REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1-36 were previously pending in this application. Within the previous Office Action, Claims 1-17 and 29-36 are rejected. Claims 18-28 are allowed. By the above amendments, Claims 1, 7, and 29 are amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-36 are now pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Within the Office Action, Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,715,372 issued to Meyers et al. (hereinafter "Meyers") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,578,007 issued to Howes et al. (hereinafter "Howes"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The present invention teaches a server that receives and stores voice files created by users of the system. The server is coupled to a speech-to-text media conversion system to receive converted text files of the audio voice files. The server includes a reviewer database that stores a plurality of skill sets for each of the reviewers. A skill set is a list of keywords that a reviewer is familiar with. For instance, for a reviewer proficient in reviewing or transcribing medical documents, his skill set will include common medical terms. The server determines which one of the reviewers should review the text document. The server makes this decision by first extracting a list of keywords from the converted text file. The keywords are extracted from the text file by searching the document and comparing it to a keyword database. The server then matches the list of keywords to the skill sets of the reviewers within the reviewer database. As a result of this matching process, one reviewer is selected to review the converted text file. The server will route the converted text document file and pointers corresponding to the voice file to a workstation associated with the selected reviewer; thus the reviewer is selected based on document content.

Meyers teaches an apparatus that extracts a feature set from an input signal. A feature extraction system 20 derives the feature set from the input signal (Meyers, Figure 1). The feature set is described as a group of signal parameters which characterize the input signal. The feature set extracted from the input signal is sent from the feature extraction system 20 to an intelligent

8

system 30. The intelligent system 30 determines a relationship between the feature set and corresponding signal characteristics. Meyers teaches that the intelligent system 30 operates on the feature set to produce an output signal which characterizes the input signal for the attribute being measured. Howes is cited for choosing a transcriptionist based on attributes from a report; thus, according to the proposed combination, the transcriptionist is selected based on an input signal.

Within the Office Action, it is stated that Meyers in view of Howes teaches the claimed limitations of independent apparatus claim 1. Specifically, on the bottom of page 2 of the Office Action, it is stated that Meyers teaches "extracting a feature set", which is said to teach the claimed limitation "means for extracting an attribute from the output." To support this assertion, column 2, lines 35-39 of Meyers is cited. Column 2, lines 35-39 of Meyers teaches in part "[t]he selected feature set is then extracted from a first input signal." There is no hint, teaching, or suggestion within Meyers that indicates a means for extracting a feature set from an output signal, where the output signal is an automatically transcribed output signal generated in response to an input. Howes is not cited for teaching means for extracting an attribute from the output.

Within the Advisory Action, it is stated that the "automatically transcribed output" language is descriptive language in the preamble and does not have patentable weight. By the above amendment to Claim 1, the "means for extracting an attribute from the output" is replaced by "means for extracting an attribute from an automatically transcribed output generated by an information processing system in response to an input." For at least this reason, the amended Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Meyers in view of Howes.

As a second reason for allowance, the Applicant contends that **the combination of Meyers and Howes is improper as lacking motivation**. As argued in the previous Response, Meyers is directed to the field of signal processing and Howes is directed to the field of transcription services. These two fields are completely unrelated. Within the Advisory Action, it is stated that Meyers and Howes are related by the commonality of transcribing. In response, the Applicant argues that the art of "transcribing" is insufficiently vague and inappropriately broad.. There is no hint, teaching, or suggestion within either Meyers or Howes that indicates output keyword characteristics of a textual document, e.g. a report (Howes), can be substituted for output signal characteristics of a signal processing device (Meyers).

Within the Office Action, it is stated that the motivation to combine Howes with Meyers

resides in column 2, lines 8-16 of Howes, which states in part that "other rules may direct the system to accord priority treatment to certain types of dictation jobs." However, such "rules" are directed to prioritization of types of reports, e.g. pre-operation reports, that take priority over other dictation jobs to be transcribed. There is no hint, teaching, or suggestion within this cited passage of Howes that indicates "other rules" are in any way related to signal characteristics, as in Meyers. Therefore, there is not proper motivation to combine Howes and Meyers.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus for improving productivity of human review of an automatically transcribed output generated by an information processing system, wherein the output is generated in response to an input. The apparatus includes <u>means for extracting an attribute from an automatically transcribed output</u> generated by an information processing system in response to an input, and means for selecting a specific one human reviewer from among a plurality of human reviewers based on the attribute. As discussed above, Meyers does not teach that the output signal is an automatically transcribed output signal. Further, there is not proper motivation to combine Howes and Meyers. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Meyers in view of Howes and as such is an allowable base claim.

Claims 2-6 are each dependent upon the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Meyers in view of Howes. Accordingly, Claims 2-6 are each also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 6-17 and 29-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,614 issued to Kahn et al. (hereinafter "Kahn") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,595 issued to Romano et al. (hereinafter "Romano"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Kahn teaches matching two different converted text documents, both related to the same voice file, and determining words that don't match when comparing the two text documents to each other. In other words, Kahn teaches means for extracting a list of words from a first text document that do not match words from a second text document (Kahn, col. 2, lines 34-38). Within the Office Action, it is acknowledged that Kahn does not teach selecting a reviewer based on a keyword.

Romano teaches presenting constructed responses through electronic workfolders for

human evaluation. Constructed responses are defined as open-ended responses, such as essay answers, to test questions. The constructed responses are sent to a reader or rater for evaluation and for receiving scores from the reader.

Within the Office Action, it is stated that Kahn teaches means for extracting a keyword from an automatically transcribed document, as claimed. However, within the Office Action, it is acknowledged that Kahn does not teach selecting a reviewer based on a keyword. The Examiner contends that Romano teaches choosing a reviewer (reader) based on a correlation between the information of the document and the reviewer's (reader's) rating, and that this is the same as selecting a reviewer based on a keyword. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this conclusion.

Romano teaches that constructed responses are transmitted to a test developer for categorization (Romano, col. 3, lines 53-56). The test developers determine a category for each constructed response (Romano, col. 3, lines 60-61). There are six categories into which these reviewed constructed responses are categorized. The categories include calibration, certification, training sample, monitoring, benchmark, and rangefinder. A rater selects a category, and the system lists available constructed responses from the selected category that also match the rater's qualification status (Romano, col. 4, lines 45-52).

Within the Advisory Action, it is stated that "the scope of the claim language 'of a plurality of raters' pertains to more than one rater – applicant is arguing the specification, and not the scope of the claim language, with respect to the plurality of raters." The Applicant assumes that this rejection is referring to the rejection of Claims 6-17 and 29-36, specifically the claim language "a plurality of reviewers" not "a plurality of raters", as stated in the Advisory Action. The Applicant also assumes that this rejection is referring to the Applicant's argument (in the "Response to Final Office Action", which was mailed by the Applicant on August 29, 2005), which contends that the system of Romano does not select a particular rater from a group of raters. First, regarding the Examiner's contention that the Applicant is arguing the specification and not the claim language, the Applicant points out that the claim language of independent Claim 7 states "means for selecting **one** of a plurality of reviewers" (emphasis added), and the claim language of the independent Claim 29 states "selecting **one** of a plurality of human reviewers" (emphasis added). Clearly, the claim language supports the Applicant's assertion that the present claims are directed to selecting one reviewer from a plurality of reviewers. However,

11

to further prosecution, the independent Claim 7 is amended to clarify that the means for selecting selects a specific one reviewer from a plurality of reviewers. Specifically, the independent Claim 7 is amended to replace "means for selecting one of a plurality of reviewers" with "means for selecting a specific one reviewer from a plurality of reviewers." Similarly, the independent Claim 29 is amended to replace "selecting one of a plurality of human reviewers" with "selecting a specific one human reviewer from a plurality fo human reviewers."

Second, the Applicant contends that the selection process performed by Romano is not the same as the claimed selection process. The present Claim 7 is directed to extracting a keyword, and in response to the keyword, one specific reviewer is selected from a plurality of reviewers. Romano teaches an opposite process. Roman teaches that a specific rater selects a category. For that selected category, the system selects all constructed responses that match the specific rater's qualification status (Romano; col. 4, lines 45-52). The rater then selects from the constructed responses provided by the system. At no point does the system of Romano select the specific rater; instead, the system of Romano selects a list of constructed responses that match a specific rater. In direct contrast, the present claims are directed to selecting a specific reviewer that matches a specific keyword(s).

The independent Claim 7 is directed to an apparatus for facilitating review of an automatically transcribed document generated by a media conversion system, wherein the document is generated in response to an input. The apparatus includes means for extracting a keyword from the document, means for selecting <u>a specific one reviewer from among a plurality of reviewers in response to the keyword</u>, and means for transmitting the input and the document to the selected reviewer for review. As discussed above, it is acknowledged by the Examiner that Kahn does not teach selecting one of a plurality of reviewers based on a keyword. Further, Romano does not teach a system that selects a specific one reviewer from a plurality of reviewers. Still further, Romano does not teach selecting the specific one reviewer in response to the extracted keyword. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of the independent Claim 7 is allowable over the teachings of Kahn in view of Romano and as such is an allowable base claim.

Claims 8-17 are each dependent upon the independent Claim 7. As discussed above, Claim 7 is allowable over the teachings of Kahn in view of Romano. Accordingly, Claims 8-17 are each also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 29 is directed to a method of improving productivity of human review of an automatically transcribed document generated by an information processing system, wherein the document is generated in response to an input. The method includes extracting an attribute from the document, and <u>selecting a specific one human reviewer from among a plurality of human reviewers</u> <u>based on the attribute</u>. As discussed above, it is acknowledged by the Examiner that Kahn does not teach selecting a specific one human reviewer from a plurality of human reviewers. Further, Romano does not teach a system that selects a specific one human reviewer from a plurality of human reviewers. Still further, Romano does not teach selecting the specific one human reviewer in response to the extracted attribute. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of the independent Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Kahn in view of Romano and as such is an allowable base claim.

Claims 30-36 are each dependent upon the independent Claim 29. As discussed above, Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Kahn in view of Romano. Accordingly, Claims 30-36 are each also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Claim 6 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Meyers in view of Howes. Accordingly, Claim 6 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 18-28 are allowed.

For at least the reasons given above, Applicant respectfully submit that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: _September 27, 2005_   By: _____
                                          Jonathan O. Owens
                                          Reg. No. 37,902
                                          Attorneys for Applicants

13